

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 06031 01 OF 02 201921Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
-----109028 201938Z /43
P 201758Z APR 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8681
INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 06031

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

MOSCOW FOR AMBASSADORS WARNKE AND EARLE

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 209. APRIL 20, 1978
(SALT TWO-1706)

SUMMARY: U.S. QUESTIONED LATEST SOVIET PROPOSAL ON ADVANCED NOTIFICATION OF ICBM LAUNCHES NOT PLANNED TO EXTEND BEYOND NATIONAL TERRITORY, WHICH WOULD COVER ONLY MULTIPLE LAUNCHES WITHIN 10 MINUTES FROM ONE TEST RANGE OR LAUNCHER DEPLOYMENT AREA. SOVIETS INDICATED THEIR PROPOSAL WAS MERELY GOOD-WILL GESTURE TO U.S. AS THEY DID NOT BELIEVE ANY ROUTINE LAUNCHES REMAINING WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY REQUIRED NOTIFICATION. TEN MINUTE PERIOD CHOSEN BECAUSE WITHIN THAT TIME NTM COULD ASCERTAIN IMPACT AREA AND TRAJECTORY OF MISSILES IN QUESTION. AT CONCLUSION, SOVIETS HINTED WILLINGNESS TO EXTEND DEFINITION OF MULTIPLE LAUNCHES TO INCLUDE THOSE TAKING PLACE AT DIFFERENT SITES, IF U.S. WOULD EXEMPT SINGLE LAUNCHES FROM DEPLOYMENT AREAS. END SUMMARY.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 06031 01 OF 02 201921Z

1. PEREZ NOTED THAT PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS HAD LED TO IMPORTANT PROGRESS TOWARD AGREEMENT ON ARTICLE XVI. HOWEVER, SIDES DISAGREE AS TO WHETHER SINGLE LAUNCHES FROM ICBM DEPLOYMENT AREAS SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION. ALSO THERE IS QUESTION OF DEFINITION OF MULTIPLE LAUNCHES. HE ASKED WHY SOVIET PROPOSAL APPLIED ONLY TO MULTIPLE

LAUNCHES FROM INDIVIDUAL TEST RANGES OR ICBM DEPLOYMENT AREAS. WAS IT SOVIET INTENTION TO EXCLUDE FROM NOTIFICATION SIMULTANEOUS LAUNCH OF FIVE ICBMS FROM FIVE SEPARATE TEST RANGES OR DEPLOYMENT AREAS IF THEY WERE NOT PLANNED TO EXTEND BEYOND NATIONAL TERRITORY?

2. KARPOV STATED THAT SOVIET FORMULATION INCLUDES ALL LAUNCHES WHICH COULD GIVE RISE TO CONCERN. LAUNCHES NOT GOING BEYOND NATIONAL TERRITORY SHOULD NOT CAUSE CONCERN BECAUSE THEY DO NOT THREATEN ANYBODY. IF SUCH LAUNCH SHOULD ACCIDENTALLY GO BEYOND NATIONAL TERRITORY, ITS NOTIFICATION IS ALREADY PROVIDED FOR IN MEASURES AGREEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 1971. SOVIET SIDE WAS WILLING TO CONSIDER NOTIFICATION OF LAUNCHES REMAINING WITHIN NATIONAL TERRITORY AS GOOD WILL GESTURE TO U.S. SIDE, BUT ONLY WITHIN REASONABLE AND RATIONAL BOUNDS. SUGGESTION THAT LAUNCHES COULD OCCUR SIMULTANEOUSLY FROM FIVE DIFFERENT AREAS WAS THEORETICAL OR FARFETCHED QUESTION. SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR COMMON UNDERSTANDING DEFINING MULTIPLE LAUNCH AS LAUNCH OF TWO OR MORE ICBMS FROM ONE RANGE OR AREA WITHIN 10 MINUTES SHOULD RESOLVE ALL U.S. QUESTIONS.

3. PEREZ REMINDED KARPOV THAT U.S. HAD WANTED TO INCLUDE ALL LAUNCHES IN PRE-NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT BUT HAD TAKEN SOVIET VIEWS INTO ACCOUNT AND AGREED TO EXEMPT SINGLE LAUNCHES FROM TEST RANGES. BUT MULTIPLE LAUNCHES FROM
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 06031 01 OF 02 201921Z

EITHER TEST OR DEPLOYMENT AREAS AND SINGLE LAUNCHES FROM DEPLOYMENT AREAS COULD CAUSE CONCERN AND SHOULD BE NOTIFIED IN ORDER TO BUILD CONFIDENCE AND REDUCE POSSIBILITY OF MISUNDERSTANDING. KARPOV REPLIED THAT SOVIETS HAD TRIED TO ACCOMMODATE U.S. WISHES BY PROVISIONS ON MULTIPLE LAUNCHES WITHIN 10 MINUTES. PEREZ ASKED WHY 10 INSTEAD OF 5 OR 30 MINUTES. KARPOV INDICATED THAT THIS WAS ROUND, MEAN, AVERAGE FIGURE, NEITHER TOO LARGE NOR TOO SMALL. BEKETOV ADDED THAT WITHIN THAT TIME PERIOD, NTM CAN DETERMINE IMPACT AREA AND TRAJECTORY OF MISSILES.

4. MCNEILL AND PEREZ RETURNED TO QUESTION OF WHY SOVIETS WERE WILLING TO NOTIFY MULTIPLE LAUNCHES FROM ONE SITE BUT NOT FROM SEVERAL SITES DURING STIPULATED TIME PERIOD. IF SOVIET SIDE BELIEVES LATTER CONTINGENCY ONLY HYPOTHETICAL, WHY NOT AGREE TO NOTIFY? IF ON THE CONTRARY SOVIET SIDE BELIEVES SUCH AN EVENT COULD OCCUR, U.S. BELIEVES IT SHOULD BE NOTIFIED.

5. BEKETOV SAID THAT IF U.S. CAREFULLY STUDIES SOVIET EXPLANATIONS IT WOULD SEE THAT POSSIBILITY OF 5 LAUNCHES FROM FIVE DIFFERENT AREAS DOES NOT ARISE, AS THIS IS

TECHNICALLY NOT POSSIBLE, EVEN IF THE ORDER WERE GIVEN AT THE SAME TIME. HE ASKED SCHNEITER, AS U.S. EXPERT, TO AGREE. SCHNEITER SAID THAT IF IT WERE A QUESTION OF EXACTLY THE SAME TIME HE WOULD AGREE. IF THIS APPLIED TO PERIOD OF TEN MINUTES, FOR EXAMPLE, HE WOULD NOT AGREE.

6. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION, KARPOV ASKED, OFF THE RECORD, WHETHER U.S. WOULD CONSIDER SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR EXEMPTING SINGLE LAUNCHES FROM DEPLOYMENT AREAS MORE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 06031 02 OF 02 201929Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
-----109278 201939Z /41

P 201758Z APR 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8682
INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 06031

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

MOSCOW FOR AMBASSADORS WARNKE AND EARLE

POSITIVELY IF SOVIETS EXTENDED DEFINITION OF MULTIPLE LAUNCHES TO INCLUDE LAUNCHES FROM DIFFERENT AREAS. PEREZ RESPONDED THAT THIS WOULD BE MAJOR STEP. PEREZ

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETINGS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), MISSILES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 20 apr 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA06031
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780169-0806
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780436/aaaabefg.tel
Line Count: 157
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 0d6e79aa-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: ONLY
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: ONLY
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17 jun 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2906399
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 209. APRIL 20, 1978 (SALT TWO-1706) SUMMARY: U.S. QUESTIONED LATEST SOVIET PROPOSAL
O
TAGS: PARM, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/0d6e79aa-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014